UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,979	03/30/2004	Scott Sibbett	21058/0206803-US0	8637
75172 Client 21058	7590 05/01/2009		EXAMINER	
c/o DARBY &	DARBY P.C.		NOGUEROLA, ALEXANDER STEPHAN	
P.O. BOX 770 CHURCH STR	EET STATION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, N	NY 10008-0770		1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/814,979	SIBBETT, SCOTT	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ALEX NOGOEROLA	1793					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 3 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07((f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex							
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	nally set in the final Offic	e action; or (2) as				
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		ΓE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	•	duaina ar aisealifeir - 4	na inquae for				
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		ie issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	,						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-11, and 13-25</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Alex Noguerola/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1795					
	a. j Examinor, / it o	00					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant proposes to amend independent claims 1 and 11 by requiring that "either the first pump channel or the second pump channel is coated to suppress electroosmotic flow." However, claims 1 and 11 already require "a voltage drop between the first and second pump electrodes causes electroosmotic flow in the first and second pump channels ..." If electrosomotic flow is suppressed in the first or second pump channel how can there also be electroosmotic flow in the first and second pump channels? The proposed limitation may also raise a question of new matter as there does not appear to be any mention in the original disclosure of using a coating to suppress electroosmosis. The only reference to a channel coating is in paragraph [0029] of the specification, which discloses using a coating to minimize "absorption of charged molecules." Claim 22 has been apparently inadvertently amended to require the steps of "applying an electric Geld gradient." There is no suport for an "electric Geld gradient" in the original disclosure. Moreover, as stated in the previous Office action, at the bottom of page 6, "The enablement problems for claims 19-21 similarly apply to claims 22-25." Claim 22 is an independent claim that has not been amended other than as just mentioned nor has its enablement been explained. As for the proposed replacement Figure 4 the Examiner declines to enter it. It is true that paragraph [0024] of the specification discloses reversing electroosmotic flow. However, doing so, so that the electrosomotic flow is from reservoir 116 to reservoir 114 would not create a convective flow in the reverse direction from that shown in the original Figure 4. Indeed, it is not readily apparent that convective flow would occur at all, since reversed electroosmotic flow would create positive pressure, not negative pressure, at the junction 124..